



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,308	07/11/2001	Masayuki . Chatani	37090-6062	1011

33123 7590 07/07/2005

DAVID A. HALL
HELLER EHRMAN LLP
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE #700
7TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,308

Applicant(s)

CHATANI ET AL.

Examiner

Phuoc H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>August 16, 2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on March 30, 2005. Previous office action contained claims 1-85. Applicant amended claims 1, 13, 16, 30, 41, 44, 58, 69, and 72; and added claims 86-89. Amendment filed on March 30, 2005 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, pending claims 1-89 is presented for further consideration and examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims and new claims added have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-12,16-18,23-40,44-46,51-68, and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sahai et al. (Hereafter, Sahai) U.S. Patent 6,594,699.

5. Regarding claims 1,30, and 58, Sahai's figure 1 discloses a method of managing the Transfer of content to a user device that is communicatively linked to a computer network,

Art Unit: 2143

comprising: obtaining user device information descriptive of a configuration of the user device (col. 2 lines 61-64; and col. 5 lines 5-6); determining capabilities of the user device to download content over the network and to process content received over the network based upon the user device information (col. 5 lines 5-14); automatically selecting a service level that is selected from among a plurality of predefined service levels and is determined to be available to the user device for transferring content thereto based upon the determined capabilities of the user device, wherein the selected service level is associated with one or more characteristics of content for transfer to the user device (col. 4 lines 32-63; and col. 6 lines 12-49).

6. Regarding claims 2,17,31,45,59, and 73, Sahai further discloses receiving a request to transfer content to the user device over the computer network, and causing content to be transferred to the user device over the network according to the selected service level (Figure 2, and col. 6 lines 12-49).

7. Regarding claims 3,32, and 60, Sahai further discloses a service level is also associated with one or more characteristics of the manner in which content is transferred to the user device over the network (col. 5 lines 7-26).

8. Regarding claims 4, Sahai further discloses identifying a list of content that can be transferred to the user device based upon the determined capabilities of the user device, and causing the list of content to be displayed at the user device (col. 6, lines 12-23).

9. Regarding claims 5,23,33,51,61, and 79, Sahai further discloses the user device information includes the amount of data (e.g. bit rate) that can be transmitted to the user device in a given amount of time over the network (col. 6 lines 12-49).

10. Regarding claims 6,24,34,52,62, and 80, Sahai further discloses the user device

Art Unit: 2143

information includes the latency of the user device with respect to a content provider device on the computer network (col. 6 lines 12-49).

11. Regarding claims 7,25,35,53,63, and 81, Sahai further discloses the user device information includes the amount of data storage capacity available to the user device (col. 3 lines 23-60).

12. Regarding claims 8,26,36,54,64, and 82, Sahai further discloses the one or more characteristics of content associated with a service level includes the size of the content (col. 4 lines 9-31).

13. Regarding claims 9,27,37,55,65, and 83, Sahai further discloses the one or more characteristics of content includes whether the content includes graphic files (col. 4 lines 9-31).

14. Regarding claims 10,28,38,56,66, and 84, Sahai further discloses the one or more characteristics of content includes whether the content is an executable file (e.g. Java) (col. 6 last paragraph through col. 7 1st paragraph).

15. Regarding claims 11,29,39,57,67, and 85, Sahai further discloses the manner in which the content is transferred to the user device comprises streaming the content to the user device (Abstract).

16. Regarding claims 12,18,40,46,68, and 74, Sahai further discloses a first service level has a corresponding minimum capabilities requirement, and further comprising selecting a first service level for the user device only if the capabilities of the user device meet the minimum capabilities requirements (col. 6 lines 35-49).

17. Regarding claims 16,44, and 72, Sahai further discloses obtaining user device information descriptive of a configuration of the user device (col. 2 lines 61-64; and col. 5 lines 5-6); identifying one or more service levels that may govern the transfer of content to the user

Art Unit: 2143

device, wherein each service level is associated with one or more characteristics of content available for transfer to the user device and the manner in which content is transferred to the user device over the network, each service level being further associated with minimum requirements relating to the configuration of the user device, making available at least one of the service levels to the user device for governing the transfer of content to the user device (col. 5 lines 5-14; and col. 6 lines 35-49); automatically selecting a service level to govern the transfer of content to the user device based upon the user device information (col. 6 lines 12-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 13-14, 19-21, 41-42, 47-49, 69-70, 75-77, and 86-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahai in view of Lipa et al. (Hereafter, Lipa) U.S. Patent 6,061,722.

20. Regarding claims 13-14, 19-21, 41-42, 47-49, 69-70, and 75-77, Sahai reference discloses selecting a service level for user device based upon the capabilities of the client device; however, Sahai fails to teach if the capabilities of the user device do not meet the minimum capabilities requirement of the first service level, determining an upgrade that could provide a different service level, and notifying the user device of the upgrade, and notifying the user device of

Art Unit: 2143

changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device in order to upgrade the capabilities of the user device.

Lipa reference teaches first service level, determining an upgrade that could provide a different service level, and notifying the user device of the upgrade, notified the user, and gave user suggestion that may be made to the configuration of the user device (col. 2 lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Lipa's teaching into Sahai's method to determine an upgrade that could provide a different service level, and notifying the user device of the upgrade, and provide suggestion what need to be changed that may be made to the user device configuration in order to improve the network connection.

21. Regarding claims 86-89, Sahai reference discloses selecting a service level for user device based upon the capabilities of the client device; however, Sahai fails to teach selecting a service level is performed at a network service manager device independent of a network provider from which the content is transferred.

Lipa reference teaches selecting a service level is performed at a network service manager device (e.g. operations center) independent of a network provider (e.g. servers 127, 129, 114, or 115) from which the content is transferred (Figures 1 and 3; col. 4 lines 1-7; col. 5 lines 7-14; and col. 6 lines 57 through col. 7 lines 37).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Lipa's teaching into Sahai's method to selecting a service level is performed at an operation center independent of a server from which the content is

Art Unit: 2143

transferred, so the operation center can determine which of the plurality of zones (e.g. server) is likely to provide the best connection for the user.

22. Claims 15,22,43,50,71, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahai and Lipa in view of Hubbard U.S. Patent 6,654,783.

Sahai and Lipa discloses first service level, determining an upgrade that could provide a different service level, and notifying the user device of the upgrade, and provide suggestion what need to be changed that may be made to the user device configuration; however, Sahai and Lipa fail to teach sending one or more advertisements to the user device regarding changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device.

Hubbard teaches sending one or more advertisements to the user device regarding changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device (col. 9, last paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Hubbard's teaching into Sahai and Lipa's method to provide advertisements to the user device regarding changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device in order to attract the user attention.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2143

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Phuoc H Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

June 23, 2005

Application/Control Number: 09/903,308

Page 9

Art Unit: 2143



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100